

Serial Number: 09/511,256

## REMARKS

The Examiner had objected to informalities on the first page. These have been corrected.

The Examiner had objected to informalities in the claims. These have been corrected. However the Examiner's objection to the recitation of "the time" in claim 6 is not well-taken. Reference should be made to MPEP section 2173.05(e) which states:

Obviously, however, the failure to supply explicit antecedent basis for terms does not always render a claim indefinite. If the scope of the claim is reasonably ascertainable by those skilled in the art, then the claim is not indefinite. . . . For example, the limitation "the outer surface of said sphere" would not require an antecedent recitation that the sphere has an outer surface".

Accordingly, claim 6's reference to "the time" that a call remains in queue should not be deemed to require recitation of an antecedent.

Similarly, the Examiner's objection to claim 13 for reciting "said individual call's position" is not seen to lack an antecedent since an antecedent basis is already provided by the preceding recitation that there is a queue of incoming calls, each of which must inherently have an individual position in the queue for that is what a queue of calls is.

The Examiner had indicated that claims 3 through 17 would be allowable over the art of record if amended to include all of the limitations priorly separately set forth in claims 1 and 2. This has been done.

Replacement drawing sheets for Figs. 1 through 4C, 6, 7 and 7-4 are enclosed.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the grounds of rejection and passage of the application to issue are therefore requested.